REMARKS

I.   Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 13-20 were withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

The Examiner objected to "the same network address" in claim 2 because of insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lim et al. Customizable Virtual Private Network Service with QoS, August 1, 2000 (hereinafter Lim).

The Examiner rejected claims 2-9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alferi et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099849 (hereafter Alfieri).

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Alfieri in view of Casey et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,205,488 (hereinafter Casey).

II.   Summary of Applicants' Reply

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 12 have been amended to further clarify and particularly point out the invention. No new matter was added by these amendments. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found on, e.g., p. 22 lines 1-5 of the originally filed application and p. 6 ¶ 70 of the published application. Support for the amendments to claims 2 and 12 can be found on, e.g., p. 23 lines 14-22 of the originally filed application and p. 7 ¶ 77 of the published application. Support for the amendment to claim 3 can be found on, e.g., p. 24 lines 1-19 of the originally filed application and p. 7 ¶¶ 78-84.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration of this application and prompt allowance is respectfully requested.

III.   35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lim. Claim1 of the application requires:

> "running generic application code on an operating system that operates in
>
> multiple contexts."

Unlike claim 1, Lim teaches the creation of a Virtual Private Network (VPN) and virtualization of packet forwarding, link bandwidth, and customized control plane programming (see p. 1, abstract). The control plane protocol is virtualized through customized control protocols (see p. 10, section 3.2.1). Lim does not teach or suggest an operating system with multiple contexts that can run generic application code. Rather, Lim teaches using customized protocols on a VPN to provide virtualization.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alferi. Claims 2 and 12 of the application require:

> "creating a process in the first routing context that inherits routing context
>
> information" (claim 2)

> "a process running on the first network that is associated with the first routing
>
> context, wherein the process inherits information from the first routing context
>
> when the process is created by the first routing context" (claim 12).

Unlike claims 2 and 12, Alferi teaches dividing memory into a number of context areas for each to serve as a virtual private routed network (VPRN) and where each VPRN employs a respective routing protocol and address space (see p. 1 ¶ 8). Alferi also discloses using general routing tasks along with selection logic to selectively couple the routing tasks to different context areas of the memory (see p. 1 ¶ 9). Alferi does not show or suggest creating a process in a context where that process inherits information from the routing context upon creation. The tasks of Alferi are fundamentally different because they are built to work with a specific protocol across multiple contexts (see abstract and ¶¶ 36-37). Claims 2 and 12 create a process that by default is built to work with the context and the network that creates the process.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 2 and 12 are allowable over Alferi. Furthermore, claims 3-9 and 11, which depend from claim 2 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn by the Examiner.

6

IV.   35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Alfieri in view of Casey. Casey discloses virtual private network realization using labels on multi-protocol packets (see col. 1, lines 1-10). The network realization involves determining all label switched paths between two routers and also all nested labeled switched paths between two routers and storing this information in a table on the same router (see col. 2, lines 4-11 and lines 26-49). Casey also discloses assigning two or more routers that are part of a shared MPLS network a VPN identifier which is used to determine label switched paths and nested label switched paths among the VPN identified routers (see col. 2, lines 26-49). Claim 2, upon which claim 10 depends, and claim 10 require:

"creating a process in the first routing context that inherits routing context information" (claim 2)

"inheriting the default first routing context by a third process, whose parent is the first process, at the time of creation of the third process." (claim 10)

Unlike claims 2-12, Casey does not show or suggest inheritance. In Casey's disclosure there is no newly created entity that receives information from a parent and context information is not passed to a process. Rather, Casey discloses sending hello messages to peer routers to determine if they have the same VPN id, if the peer router does have the same VPN id, then a LDP session is setup between the two routers and the router forwarding tables are updated (see col. 4, lines 16-55). The Examiner stated "Casey discloses inheriting the default first routing context by a third process, whose parent is the first process, at the time of creation of the third process" (Office Action, p. 10). Looking at the cited portion, column 2, lines 26-49, applicants could find no mention of inheritance, context, parent, or process and no mention of inheritance, context, or patent in the entire application. Therefore, the combination of Casey and Alfieri fails to show or suggest each and every claim limitation.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 2 and 12 are allowable over Alfieri, and further claim 10 is allowable over the combination of Alfieri and Casey. Furthermore, claims 3-11, which depend from claim 2 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn by the Examiner.

US1Docs 6147443v1

Applicants wish to clarify for the record, if necessary, that any claims that have been canceled are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and applicants reserve the right to further prosecute these claims in continuing applications. For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including each of claims 1-12, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance is respectfully requested.

US1Docs 6147443v1

V. Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this Reply, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0219

In the event that an Extension of Time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an Extension of Time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that Extension of Time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an Extension of Time or credit any overpayment for an Extension of Time to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP

Date: _5/11/07_

Benjamin K. Brown
Registration No. 59,250
Agent for Applicants

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
399 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Tel. 212-230-8800
Fax. 212-230-8888
Customer No. 28089

9